

Applicant: Teppo Kojo
Application No.: 10/554,009
Response to Office action mailed Jun. 5, 2008
Response filed Oct. 6, 2008

Remarks

Claims 10–26, 28–30 remain pending in the application. In the Office action dated Jun. 5, 2008, claims 10–26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Bush et al. (US 6,873,879). Claim 28 was objected to for not being supported by the specification, and the drawings were objected to as not showing all the elements of claim 28. The specification was objected to for lacking parenthesis in one location. Claim 20 was objected to for missing a space. Claim 27 was objected to for not being exactly supported by the specification. Claims 10–18 were objected to for using the term “calculating/optimizing”. Claims 10, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17–18 were objected to as indefinite.

Paragraph 008 has been amended to place a citation within parentheses as required by the examiner.

Claim 13 has been amended to remove reference to “the” restrictions.

Claim 14 has been amended to remove reference to “the number”.

Claim 15 has been amended based on paragraph 0023 of the specification.

Claims 16, 17, and 18 have been amended to remove the objected to language.

Claim 20 has been amended to add a missing space, as pointed out by the examiner.

Claim 28 has been amended to change “increased” to “reduced” in accord with the examiner’s comment, and the drawings therefor are now in accord with the claims. In a telephone interview Sep. 23, 2008, examiner Ryan Jarrett indicated that the drawings were otherwise acceptable, and new drawings were not required. Claims 27 and 28 have been rewritten in independent form.

“Calculating/optimizing” has been replaced in the claims with “calculating and optimizing”.

The claimed invention is limited to a method in which the diameter of the machine reel to be wound is determined on the basis of restrictions set on the location of a splice in the customer roll.

The examiner has rejected claims 10–26 as lacking novelty in view of Bush et al., and contends that Bush et al. discloses:

Applicant: Teppo Kojo
Application No.: 10/554,009
Response to Office action mailed Jun. 5, 2008
Response filed Oct. 6, 2008

determining the diameter of the machine reel to be wound on the paper or board machine on the basis of restrictions set by the customer on the location of a splice in the customer roll (e.g., col. 1 lines 46-50, col. 2 lines 43-57, col. 4 line 54-col. 5 line 7, col. 6 lines 37-67).

Jun. 5, 2008, Office action, p. 8, lines 20-22. (Also see identical pinpoint cites given for the same limitation with respect to claim 19, in the Office action, p. 11, lines 2-5.) Although Bush et al. recognizes the need to splice the paper from two reels to complete or "top-out" a set when the first reel is of insufficient length (col. 1, lines 46-48), it does not address "restrictions set by the customer on the location of a splice in a customer roll".

There is no hint in Bush et al. about considering the location of a splice in the customer roll (smaller roll) when calculating the diameter of the reel. In the claimed invention the reel diameter of the machine roll is determined on the basis of restrictions on the location of the splice in a customer roll. Thus the claimed invention addresses the problem of winding machine rolls of a desired diameter/length and at the same time avoiding splices on locations close to the inner or outer diameter of the customer roll.

Objected to claim 27 has been cancelled, and new claims 29 and 30 have been added.

Applicant believes that no new matter has been added by this amendment.

Applicant submits that the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance.

Favorable action thereon is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



David R. J. Stiennon, Reg. No. 33212
Attorney for Applicant
Stiennon & Stiennon
P.O. Box 1667
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1667
(608) 250-4870
Amdt2.res

October 6, 2008 (8:47pm)